

A.—Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—

Yes. The Topo Sheet showing the areas declared as the private properties of the Ruler as per the agreement of merger and the properties of the Kumar-swamy and other allied Temples of which the Ruler is the hereditary trustee has been authenticated by the Government of India. The Government of India have recognised the position of the Raja as hereditary Trustee of the Temples. No discrepancies as alleged have come to notice.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—May I know whether this matter was before the Ministry of the Mysore Government and whether any discrepancy was found between the Merger agreement and the topo sheet?

†**Sri B. D. JATTI**.—The Merger agreement has nothing to do with the Topo sheet.

***Sri M. RAMAPPA**.—Is it not necessary that the Topo sheet should be in accordance with the Merger agreement and if so, whether there is any discrepancy between the two?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—In the Merger agreement there is no mention about the Topo sheet but there is another letter which has accompanied the Merger agreement. There, mention of the Topo sheet is made.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Government place on the Table of the House an authenticated copy of this agreement and also the boundaries which are now in dispute?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I do not think it is necessary. It is an agreement between the Government of India and the Raja.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The whole point is, if there is a discrepancy between what was intended to be recognised as the Ruler's and the Trust property, I think this House is entitled to look into it to raise any supplementary issues that may arise out of that.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—There is no discrepancy because whatever the Government of India agreed to, that has been accepted by this Government.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know how this Government came to a

decision about the Topo sheet that there is no discrepancy at all?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—This Government never came to a conclusion; it is the Madras Government. We are having a document accepted by the Madras Government and the Central Government.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALA.—Is it a fact that this matter was reviewed by one of the Ministers of this Government and the decision was reached that there was a definite discrepancy and more claim is made by the ex-Ruler than he is entitled to?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I do not know which Minister signed and on what date. If the Hon'ble Member makes a specific reference, I will be in a position to reply to it.

Construction of Thirumani Ane in Bagepalli taluk.

***Q.—607. Sri S. MUNI RAJU** (Chikballapur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether it is a fact that Thirumani Ane in Bagepalli Taluk was sanctioned long back?

(b) if so, what action has been taken to construct the same?

A.—Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—

(a) No.

(b) An estimate was prepared and is pending approval for want of concurrence of the Andhra Pradesh Government who have suggested that gaugings should be conducted for at least three seasons to determine the flow of the river at the site proposed for the Ane.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಮುನಿರಾಜು.—ಅಂದಾಜನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧ ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ಯಾವಾಗ?

†**Sri M. N. NAGHNOOR**.—About two to three years back.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಮುನಿರಾಜು.—ನುಮಾರು ಏಳು-ಎಂಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಇದರ ಅಂದಾಜನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧ ಪಡಿಸಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?